arXiv:1106.2850v2 [quant-ph] 10 Feb 2012

Universal quantum state merging

Igor Bjelaković, Holger Boche, Gisbert Janßen
Electronic addresses: {igor.bjelakovic, boche, gisbert.janssen}@tum.de

Lehrstuhl für Theoretische Informationstechnik, Technische Universität München,
80290 München, Germany

February 14, 2012

Dedicated to the memory of Rudolf Ahlswede

Abstract

We determine the optimal entanglement rate of quantum state merging when assuming that the state is unknown except for its membership in a certain set of states. We find that merging is possible at the lowest rate allowed by the individual states. Additionally, we establish a lower bound for the classical cost of state merging under state uncertainty. To this end we give an elementary proof for the cost in case of a perfectly known state which makes no use of the "resource framework". As applications of our main result, we determine the capacity for one-way entanglement distillation if the source is not perfectly known. Moreover, we give another achievability proof for the entanglement generation capacity over compound quantum channels.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Related work . . . 3
1.2 Outline . . . 3
1.3 Notations and Conventions . . . 3

2 Definitions and main result **5**

3 One-shot result **6**
3.1 Properties of the fidelity measure . . . 6
3.2 Protocol and decoupling for single states . . . 7
3.3 One shot bound for finite sets of states . . . 9

4 Proof of the merging theorem **13**
4.1 Typical subspaces . . . 13
4.2 Proof of the direct part in case of finite sets of states . . . 14
4.3 Proof of the direct part for arbitrary sets of states . . . 17
4.4 Proof of the converse part . . . 19

5 Classical communication cost of state merging **20**

6 Applications **26**
6.1 Entanglement distillation under state uncertainty 27
6.2 Entanglement generation over compound quantum channels 30

7 Conclusion **32**

1 Introduction

Quantum state merging was introduced by Horodecki, Oppenheim, and Winter [17], [18] in order to quantify the amount of partial quantum information contained in bipartite quantum states. I.e. for a bipartite i.i.d. quantum source with generic state ρ_{AB} shared by communication parties A ("sender") and B ("receiver"), we want to know how much quantum communication is needed per copy when transferring A's share to B so that source output is completely available to B.

A convenient way of measuring quantum communication within this scenario is quantifying the entanglement cost (cf. [18]): The parties A and B are free to use local operations together with certain exchange of classical messages (LOCC) and moreover they may use preexistent pure entanglement. The protocol performs state merging and produces/returns pure entanglement. The optimal rate for this task was determined in [18] as the conditional von Neumann entropy $S(A|B)$. In this way, the conditional von Neumann entropy obtains an operational interpretation as the net amount of entanglement resources needed to merge the states. Moreover, the puzzling fact that for some states $S(A|B) < 0$ can occur can be interpreted naturally within the state merging paradigm: Merging protocols achieving negative rates produce rather than consume entanglement during the process.

Additionally, the optimal (i.e. the lowest possible) classical communication rate for a merging procedure achieving quantum rate $S(A|B)$ was determined in [18] as well. It turned out that $I(A;E)$, the quantum mutual information between the A-part and an environment purifying ρ_{AB} is optimal in this case.

Another important aspect is that many other protocols can be derived (mostly by reduction) from quantum state merging. Here we just mention some of the examples from [18] like distributed compression, quantum source coding with side information at the decoder, and entanglement generation over quantum multiple access channels.

However, these results rely on the assumption of idealized conditions. The authors of [18] assumed the source to be memoryless and perfectly known. Both of these conditions will hardly be fulfilled in real-life communication settings.

In this paper, we drop the second condition and determine the optimal average cost of entanglement per copy under partial ignorance of the state to be merged. We consider a scenario, where statistical properties of the ensemble emitted by the source are not perfectly known to the merging partners. Rather it is assumed, that they only know that the state belongs to a certain set of states. Thus they have to use a protocol which works well for every member of this set. This model can be seen as a source analogue to the notion of compound quantum channels which were considered in [7], [8].

Our main technical result is a generalization of the original one-shot bound given in [18], which respects state uncertainty. The question of the optimal classical communication cost in this case is addressed as well.

The result of this paper becomes its relevance due to the fact, that other related communication protocols can be obtained by modifying state merging protocols. Our generalization to sets of states can be used to generate protocols which are successful in the corresponding "compound" scenarios. These in turn are stepping stones to tackle the much more involved "arbitrarily varying" models. If one considers, for example, the problem of determining capacities of arbitrarily varying channels, it is well known that good codes for particular compound channels can be transformed in good random codes for arbitrarily varying channels via Ahlswede's robustification technique [3]. The robustification technique can be applied in the quantum case as well. It is exactly this idea that was employed in [4] in order to determine the random code capacity for entanglement transmission over arbitrarily varying quantum channels. This in turn can

be used to show that either the deterministic classical capacity of the arbitrarily varying quantum channel is zero or the deterministic and random code capacities for entanglement transmission of these channels are equal, a quantum version of Ahlswede's famous dichotomy [2].
We mention this here, because this is up to date the only method allowing us to prove such results. The ingenious and very direct method to prove the coding theorem for classical arbitrarily varying channels developed by Csiszár and Narayan [10] does not carry over to the quantum case.

1.1 Related work

The present result relies, as it was in the single state case, on a variant of the so-called decoupling approach, an idea which originally appeared in [22] and was succesfully applied to several scenarios. The idea is, in short, to consider not only the bipartite states to merge, but purifications of them, where the purifying systems are not allowed to be affected by A or B. In this way, the question of success of the procedure is broken down to successful decoupling of the subsystems under control of A from the purifying environment. Techniques which were developed earlier [7], [8] for proving coding theorems for compound quantum channels based on the decoupling approach, can be used here as well.
The quantum state merging protocol can be further generalized, by replacing the classical communication channels involved by quantum channels. This leads to the so-called fully quantum Slepian Wolf or "mother" protocol [1], which together with a corresponding "father" protocol forms the head of a whole hierarchy of quantum protocols.

1.2 Outline

In Section 2, we provide precise definitions for the model considered in this work. At the end of the section, our main result is stated. Section 3 contains the technical groundwork for the proof of our main result. There, we generalize the original one-shot result for single states from [18] to the case, where the set of possible states to merge is finite. With these results at hand, we prove our main result in Section 4, where we first establish the direct part in case that the set of possible states to merge is finite. Then we extend this result to arbitrary sets of states using finite approximations in the set of quantum states. The converse statement directly carries over from the known result for single states. Section 5 is devoted to the classical communication cost of quantum state merging. There we review the single state case and add an elementary proof for the corresponding result from [18]. Unfortunately, the protocol class used to establish the achievability proof for the quantum cost turns out to be too narrow. We point out, that contrary to the single state case, it is suboptimal regarding the classical communication requirements.
We conclude our work by demonstrating some applications of our main result in Sect. 6, where we determine the entanglement distillation capacity in case, that the source from which is distilled is not perfectly known. Finally, we give another proof for the direct part of the entanglement generation coding theorem for compound quantum channels. There we use the correspondence between distillation of entanglement from quantum states and entanglement generation over quantum channels.

1.3 Notations and Conventions

All the Hilbert spaces which appear in this work are assumed to be finite dimensional and over the field of complex numbers. For any two Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$ denotes the set of linear operators mapping $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The set of states (i.e. positive operators of trace one) on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. With a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$, the set of channels (i.e. completely positive and trace preserving maps) from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K})$ is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$, the set of trace non-increasing cp maps by $\mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$. With a little abuse of notation, we write $id_{\mathcal{H}}$ for the identical channel on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Because we mainly deal with systems containing several relevant subsystems, we freely make use of the following convention: An Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{XYZ}$ is always thought to be the space of a composite system consisting of systems with Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_X$, $\mathcal{H}_Y$ and $\mathcal{H}_Z$. We use a similar notation for states of composite systems. A state denoted ρ_{XY} for instance is a bipartite state with marginals ρ_X and ρ_Y and so on. Pure states on $\mathcal{H}$ are identified with state vectors, e.g. the symbol ψ sometimes denotes the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ and sometimes a state vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ corresponding to $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. The fidelity is defined by

$$F(\rho, \sigma) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2$$

for quantum states ρ and σ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. We frequently use the fact that if one of the input states is pure, the fidelity takes the form of an inner product

$$F(\rho, |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \langle\psi, \rho\psi\rangle\,. \tag{1}$$

For other properties of the fidelity we refer to [19]. The von Neumann entropy of a state ρ is defined

$$S(\rho) := -\mathrm{tr}(\rho \log \rho)$$

where $\log(\cdot)$ (as throughout this work) denotes the base two logarithm. For certain other information quantities we choose a notation which indicates the states on which they are evaluated. For a state ρ_{XY} on $\mathcal{H}_{XY}$ we denote the coherent information by

$$I(X\rangle Y, \rho_{XY}) := S(\rho_Y) - S(\rho_{XY}),$$

the quantum mutual information by

$$I(X; Y, \rho_{XY}) := S(\rho_X) + S(\rho_Y) - S(\rho_{XY}),$$

and the contional von Neumann entropy by

$$S(X|Y, \rho_{XY}) := S(\rho_{XY}) - S(\rho_Y).$$

For a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and and a state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$, the coherent information is denoted by

$$I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}) := S(\mathcal{N}(\rho)) - S((id_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \mathcal{N})(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)),$$

where φ is an arbitrary purification of ρ on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$. We further denote the hermitian conjugate of an operator a by a^* and the complex conjugate of a complex number z by $\overline{z}$.

Concluding this section, we specify the notion of one-way LOCC channels. For bipartite Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{AB}$, a channel $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}, \mathcal{K}_{AB})$ is called a *LOCC channel with one-way classical communication from A to B*, if can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k(\rho) \tag{2}$$

for every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, where D is finite, $\{\mathcal{A}_k\}_{k=1}^D \subset \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{K}_A)$ is an instrument, i.e. $\sum_{k=1}^D \mathcal{A}_k$ is trace preserving, and $\{\mathcal{B}_k\}_{k=1}^D$ is a set of channels mapping states on $\mathcal{H}_B$ to states on $\mathcal{K}_B$. The interpretation of (2) is, that B chooses a channel for his system which depends on which of the D operations has been realized on A's system.

The amount of $A \to B$ classical communication required for application of $\mathcal{M}$ is therefore determined by the possible measurement outcomes assigned to the operations $\mathcal{A}_1, ..., \mathcal{A}_D$, i.e. a message of lenght $\lceil \log D \rceil$ bits has to be communicated.

2 Definitions and main result

Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a set of bipartite states with subsystems distributed to (possibly) distant communication partners A and B. An (l, k_l)-merging for $\mathcal{X}$ is an one-way LOCC channel

$$\mathcal{M}_l : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^0_{AB}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^1_{AB}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_{B'B}),$$

with local operations on the A- and the B-subscripted spaces and classical $A \to B$ communication, where $\mathcal{K}^i_A \simeq \mathcal{K}^i_B$ for $i = 0, 1$ and $k_l := \dim \mathcal{K}^0_A / \dim \mathcal{K}^1_A$. A real number R is called an achievable *entanglement rate* for $\mathcal{X}$, if there exists a sequence of (l, k_l)-mergings with

1. $\limsup\limits_{l \to \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log(k_l) \leq R$
2. $\inf\limits_{\mathcal{X}_p} F(\mathcal{M}_l \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_E}(\phi^l_0 \otimes \psi^{\otimes l}_{ABE}), \phi^l_1 \otimes \psi^{\otimes l}_{B'BE}) \to 1$ for $l \to \infty$.

where $\phi^l_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}^{0,l}_{AB})$ and $\phi^l_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}^{1,l}_{AB})$ are maximally entangled states on their spaces. We demand that the Schmidt ranks of these states do not grow more than exponentially fast for $l \to \infty$, i.e. $\dim \mathcal{K}^{0,l}_A, \dim \mathcal{K}^{1,l}_A \leq 2^{lC}$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and some constant $C > 0$. Note that the fraction $\dim \mathcal{K}^{0,l}_A / \dim \mathcal{K}^{1,l}_A$ equals, by definition, the fraction of the Schmidt ranks of the input and output entanglement resources ϕ^l_0 and ϕ^l_1. Therefore, the expression $\frac{1}{l} \log(k_l)$ corresponds to the number of maximally entangled qubits (ebits) per input copy consumed (or gathered) by the action of $\mathcal{M}_l$.

The infimum in the second condition is evaluated over a set $\mathcal{X}_p$ which contains a purification ψ_{ABE} on a space $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ for each ρ_{AB} in $\mathcal{X}$. $\psi_{B'BE}$ is the state ψ_{ABE} where the A-part is located on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{B'}$ under B's control. The fidelity measure in 2.) is independent of the choice of the purifications (which will be shown in the next section). We frequently use the abbreviation

$$F_m(\rho_{AB}, \mathcal{M}) := F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}), \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE})$$

for a state ρ_{AB} and a merging channel $\mathcal{M}$ for ρ_{AB} and frequently not specify the space $\mathcal{H}_E$ explicitly. The maximally entangled input and output states ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 are considered to be determined by $\mathcal{M}$. The optimal entanglement rate $C_m(\mathcal{X})$, i.e.

$$C_m(\mathcal{X}) := \inf\{R : R \text{ is an achievable entanglement rate for } \mathcal{X}\}$$

is called the *merging cost* of $\mathcal{X}$.

The main result of this paper is the following theorem, which quantifies the merging cost of any set $\mathcal{X}$ of bipartite states.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be an arbitrary set of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Then*

$$C_m(\mathcal{X}) = \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} S(A|B; \rho). \tag{3}$$

To prove the achievability part of the above Theorem 1 we show that we find universal protocols for state merging within the class of LOCC operations which was used by the authors of [18]. We give a brief outline of our proof of Theorem 1. In Sect. 3.1 we state and prove some important facts about the fidelity measure under consideration. We follow this path and recall the decoupling lemma given in [18] in Sect. 3.2. On this basis we establish a one-shot bound for finite sets of states in Section 3.3. To this end we utilize techniques developed in [7] and [8] for proving coding theorems for compound quantum channels. In Sect. 4.2 we provide the direct part of our merging theorem for finite sets of states and extend these results to arbitrary sets in Sect. 4.3. The converse theorem easily carries over from [18], and we just provide the missing link in Sect. 4.4.

3 One-shot result

3.1 Properties of the fidelity measure

In this section we aim to prove some important properties of the merging fidelity.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^0_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^1_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ *be a channel,* $\phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}^0_{AB})$*, and* $\phi_1 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{K}^1_{AB})$ *maximally entangled states. Then the following assertions hold*

1. *For any state* $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ *on* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ *with purification* $\psi_{ABE} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$*,*

$$F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}), \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}) = \sum_{z=1}^{Z} |\mathrm{tr}(p_z \rho_{AB})|^2$$

   holds, where $p_1, ...p_Z$ *are elements of* $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ *which depend on* $\mathcal{M}, \phi_0$ *and* ϕ_1*.*

2. *Merging fidelity is a convex function of the input state. For any two states* ρ_1 *and* ρ_2 *on* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ *and* $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$F_m(\lambda\rho_1 + (1-\lambda)\rho_2, \mathcal{M}) \ \leq \ \lambda F_m(\rho_1, \mathcal{M}) + (1-\lambda) F_m(\rho_2, \mathcal{M})$$

   holds.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{M}(\cdot) := \sum_{z=1}^{Z} m_z (\cdot) m_z^*$$

be a Kraus decomposition of $\mathcal{M}$ with operators $m_z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}^0_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{AB}, \mathcal{K}^1_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ for every $z \in \{1, ..., Z\}$. We define channels $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ which incorporate the input and output states ϕ_0 and ϕ_1. Let $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}, \mathcal{K}^1_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ be the channel constituted by Kraus operators $v_z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}, \mathcal{K}^1_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ defined by

$$v_z x := m_z(\phi_0 \otimes x)$$

for every $1 \leq z \leq Z$, $x \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and $\mathcal{W}(\cdot) := w(\cdot)w^*$ with

$$wx := \phi_1 \otimes (U \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B})x$$

for every $x \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Here, $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_{B'})$ is the isometry which identifies $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_{B'}$. With these definitions at hand we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}), \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}) =& F(\mathcal{V} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE}), \mathcal{W} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE})) \\ =& \sum_{z=1}^{Z} \langle (w \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\psi, (v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E}) |\psi\rangle \langle\psi| (v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})^* (w \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\psi \rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The RHS of (4) is due to the fact that the fidelity admits a representation in terms of an inner product if one of the inputs is pure, see eq. (1). The summands on the RHS of eq. (4) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi, (w^* v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E}) |\psi\rangle \langle\psi| (v_z^* w \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\psi \rangle &= \langle \psi, (w^* v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\psi \rangle \overline{\langle \psi, (w^* v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E})\psi \rangle} \\ &= |\mathrm{tr}((w^* v_z \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_E}) |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)|^2 \\ &= |tr(w^* v_z \rho_{AB})|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Inserting the RHS of eq. (5) into (4) yields

$$F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}), \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}) = \sum_{z=1}^{Z} |\mathrm{tr}(w^* v_z \rho_{AB})|^2,$$

which is the desired result, if we set $p_z = w^* v_z$ for every z. The second assertion of the Lemma is a direct consequence of the first one. $\square$

3.2 Protocol and decoupling for single states

In this section we briefly recall a result from [18] which marks the starting point for our investigations. Fortunately, the protocol constructed there, which is of relatively simple structure, can be modified for our purposes. Let d_A be the dimension of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. For an integer $0 < L \leq d_A$ we use the term *L-merging* if we speak of a channel

$$\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{K}_{AB}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{B'B})$$

which is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \sum_{k=0}^{D} a_k \otimes u_k(\rho) a_k^* \otimes u_k^*, \tag{6}$$

for every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. Here D is defined $D := \lfloor \frac{d_A}{L} \rfloor$ and $\mathcal{K}_A$ and $\mathcal{K}_B$ are Hilbert spaces with $\dim \mathcal{K}_A = \dim \mathcal{K}_B = L$ and $\mathcal{K}_A \subset \mathcal{H}_A$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{H}_A$, where

- $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{D} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{K}_A)$ is a set of rank L partial isometries (except a_0 which has rank $d_A - L \cdot D < L$) with pairwise orthogonal initial subspaces (in the following, we call such channels *L-instrument* for short).
- $\{u_k\}_{k=0}^{D} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{K}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ is a family of isometries.

We abbreviate the corresponding operation with $\mathcal{A}_k := a_k(\cdot)a_k^*$ for every k. Let ψ_{ABE} be a purification of ρ_{AB} on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$. For notational simplicity we define abbreviations

$$p_k := \mathrm{tr}(a_k \rho_A a_k^*) \quad \text{and} \qquad \rho_{AE}^k := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE})).$$

for every $k \in \{0, ..., D\}$. The following lemma is taken from [18], we repeat it here including a sketch of the proof which we give for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 2 (cf. [18], Prop. 3)**.** *Let ρ_{AB} be a bipartite state on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{D} \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{K}_A)$ an L-instrument. There exists a family $\{u_k\}_{k=0}^{D}$ of isometries completing $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{D}$ to an L*-merging *$\mathcal{M}$ which satisfies*

$$F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE}), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}) \geq 1 - \tilde{Q}.$$

where $\tilde{Q}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{Q} := 2\left(p_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{D} \left\| \rho_{AE}^k - \frac{L}{d_A} \pi_L \otimes \rho_E \right\|_1 \right). \tag{7}$$

Here, the state ϕ_L is maximally entangled on $\mathcal{K}_{AB}$ and π_L denotes the maximally mixed state on $\mathcal{K}_A$ (i.e. $\pi_L := \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}_A}}{L}$).

In the following proof, the well known relations (see [15])

$$F(\rho,\sigma) \geq 1 - \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \quad \text{and} \tag{8}$$

$$\|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho,\sigma)} \tag{9}$$

between trace distance and fidelity of any two states ρ and σ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ are used.

Proof. For every k, $0 \leq k \leq D$ the (subnormalized) state $\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE})$ is a purification of ρ^k_{AE} and $\phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}$ is a purification of $\pi_L \otimes \rho_E$. These facts and Uhlmann's theorem ([24], see [19] for the finite dimensional version) guarantee that for every $k \in \{0, ..., D\}$ there exists an isometry $u_k : \mathcal{H}_B \to \mathcal{K}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B}$ satisfying

$$F(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE}), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}) = F(\rho^k_{AE}, \pi_L \otimes \rho_E), \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_k(\cdot) := u_k(\cdot)u_k^*$. The rest is mostly done by lower bounding the fidelity in terms of the trace distance. Given the case that $p_k > 0$ for k, using (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\rho^k_{AE}, \pi_L \otimes \rho_E) &= p_k F\left(\frac{1}{p_k}\rho^k_{AE}, \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\right) \\ &\geq p_k - \|\rho^k_{AE} - p_k \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In case that $p_k = 0$ for k, $F(\rho^k_{AE}, \pi_L \otimes \rho_E) = 0$. Taking the sum over all k we arrive at

$$F\left(\sum_{k=0}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE}), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{D} F(\rho^k_{AE}, \pi_L \otimes \rho_E) \tag{12}$$

$$\geq 1 - \sum_{k=0}^{D} \|\rho^k_{AE} - p_k \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \tag{13}$$

$$\geq 1 - 2p_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{D} \|\rho^k_{AE} - p_k \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1. \tag{14}$$

Eq. (12) follows from the linearity of the fidelity in one of the inputs given the other one is pure and (10). For (13) we used (11) along with the fact that $\sum_{k=0}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k$ is a channel implying $\sum_k p_k = 1$. The RHS of (14) holds because the trace distance of any two states is upper bounded by 2 which ensures

$$\|\rho^0_{AE} - p_0 \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq 2p_0.$$

It remains to show that $\|\rho^k_{AE} - p_k \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq 2\|\rho^k_{AE} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1$, which can be seen as follows. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho^k_{AE} - p_k \pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1 \leq& \|\rho^k_{AE} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1 + |p_k - \frac{L}{d_A}| \\ \leq& 2 \cdot \|\rho^k_{AE} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_E\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is obtained by adding a zero and applying the triangle inequality together with the fact that every quantum state has trace norm one. The second line is by monotonicity of the trace norm under the action of cptp maps. $\square$

3.3 One shot bound for finite sets of states

In this section we consider a finite set $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and derive a bound for the minimal merging fidelity of the states in $\mathcal{X}$ which is based on Lemma 2. The main ingredient for the proof is the observation, that a good merging scheme for the averaged state

$$\overline{\rho}_{AB} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_{AB,i} \tag{15}$$

will be good for every single member of $\mathcal{X}$. This is due to convexity of the merging fidelity (see Lemma 1). Now let $\psi_{ABE,i}$ be any purification of $\rho_{AB,i}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ for every $i \in [N]$. The state

$$|\overline{\psi}_{ABR}\rangle\langle\overline{\psi}_{ABR}| := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} |\psi_{ABE,i}\rangle\langle\psi_{ABE,j}| \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \tag{16}$$

with $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^N$ being an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{C}^N$ is a purification of $\overline{\rho}_{AB}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{ABR}$ with $\mathcal{H}_R := \mathcal{H}_E \otimes \mathbb{C}^N$. The following lemma provides a lower bound for the fidelity of an L-merging of $\overline{\rho}_{AB}$ in terms of quantities determined by the states in $\mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 3. *Let $\{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ be a set of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Then for the corresponding averaged state $\overline{\rho}_{AB}$ and purifications $\psi_{ABE,1},...,\psi_{ABE,N}$, Lemma 2 also holds with $\tilde{Q}$ replaced by*

$$Q := 2\left(p_0 + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{D}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\sqrt{L_{ij}\cdot T_{ij}^{(k)}}\right)$$

where $L_{ij} := L \cdot \min_{m\in\{i,j\}}\{rank(\rho_{E,m})\}$ and

$$T_{ij}^{(k)} := \left\|\rho_{AE,ij}^{k} - \tfrac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij}\right\|_2^2.$$

Here we used the definitions

$$\psi_{ABE,ij} := |\psi_{ABE,i}\rangle\langle\psi_{ABE,j}|\,,\ \rho_{E,ij} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AB}}(\psi_{ABE,ij}),\ \textit{and}$$
$$\rho_{AE,ij}^{k} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}((a_k \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}})\psi_{ABE,ij}(a_k^* \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}}))$$

for $i,j \in [N], k \in [D]$.

Proof. Define

$$\overline{\rho}_R := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AB}}(\overline{\psi}_{ABR}),\ \text{ and }\ \overline{\rho}_{AR}^{k} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}((a_k \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{BR}})\overline{\psi}_{ABR}(a_k^* \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_{BR}}))$$

for every $k \in [D]$. We bound the trace distance terms on the RHS of (7) for ρ_{AB} with its purification introduced in eq. (16). Explicitly, for every $k \in [D]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \overline{\rho}^k_{AR} - \tfrac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \overline{\rho}_R \right\|_1 \\
&\overset{\text{(a)}}{=} \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left\{ \rho^k_{AE,ij} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij} \right\} \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \right\|_1 \\
&\overset{\text{(b)}}{\leq} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left\| \left\{ \rho^k_{AE,ij} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij} \right\} \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \right\|_1 \\
&\overset{\text{(c)}}{\leq} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left\| \rho^k_{AE,ij} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij} \right\|_1 \\
&\overset{\text{(d)}}{\leq} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \sqrt{L_{ij}} \left\| \rho^k_{AE,ij} - \tfrac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij} \right\|_2 .
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_{ij} := L \cdot \min\{\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{E,i}), \mathrm{rank}(\rho_{E,j})\}$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq N$. The above (in)equalities are justified by the following arguments. (a) by definition of $\overline{\rho}_R$ and $\overline{\rho}^k_{AR}$, (b) by use of the triangle inequality and (c) because the trace norm is multiplicative with respect to tensor products and the equality $\| \, |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \, \|_1 = 1$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq N$. The well known relation $\|x\|_1 \leq \sqrt{r}\|x\|_2$ between the trace- and Hilbert-Schmidt norms with r being the rank of x justifies (d), if the rank of the matrix

$$\rho^k_{AE,ij} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij}$$

is smaller or equal than L_{ij} for all $i, j \in [N]$. This is fulfilled, which can be seen as follows. Let with an orthonormal basis $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^{\dim \mathcal{H}_E}$ of $\mathcal{H}_E$,

$$\psi_{ABE,i} := \sum_{k=1}^{r_i} \psi^{(i)}_{AB,k} \otimes f_k \tag{17}$$

be a Schmidt decomposition of $\psi_{ABE,i}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq N$, with the Schmidt coefficients incorporated in the first tensor factors. This is always possible since we are free in the choice of the purifications. Using (17), one can verify, that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho^k_{AE,ij} - \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \otimes \rho_{E,ij} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{r_i} \sum_{l=1}^{r_j} \left(a_k \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(|\psi^{(i)}_{AB,k}\rangle\langle\psi^{(j)}_{AB,l}|) a_k^* - \langle \psi^{(j)}_{AB,l}, \psi^{(i)}_{AB,k} \rangle \frac{L}{d_A}\pi_L \right) \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_l| .
\end{aligned}$$

holds for every $i, j \in [N]$. This expression can be interpreted as an $r_i \times r_j$ block matrix with each block an $L \times L$ matrix. It has therefore rank smaller or equal $L \cdot \min\{r_i, r_j\}$. □

Let $L \in \{1, ..., d_A\}$ be fixed and an arbitrary but fixed L-instrument $\mathcal{A} := \{\mathcal{A}_k\}_{k=1}^D \subset \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{K}_A)$ be given. Every unitary $v \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ defines a channel $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ via $\mathcal{V}(\cdot) := v(\cdot)v^*$. With these definitions, for every v, we get an L-instrument $\mathcal{A}(v)$ with

$$\mathcal{A}(v) := \{\mathcal{A}_k \circ \mathcal{V}\}_{k=0}^D .$$

Every collection of isometric channels $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k=0}^D \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B, \mathcal{K}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ completes $\mathcal{A}(v)$ to an L-merging

$$\sum_{k=0}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \circ \mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{U}_k(\cdot) \tag{18}$$

We define the function

$$F_m(\rho,\mathcal{A}(v)) := \max_{\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k=0}^{D}} F_m(\rho_{AB},\sum_{k=1}^{D}\mathcal{A}_k\circ\mathcal{V}\otimes\mathcal{U}_k(\cdot)) \tag{19}$$

for every $v\in\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$, $\rho\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. The maximization in (19) is over all collections $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k=0}^{D}\subset\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B,\mathcal{K}_B\otimes\mathcal{H}_{B'B})$ of isometric channels.

The expected merging fidelity under random selection of such L-mergings according to the normalized Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ is bounded in the following lemma, which is the key technical result for the proof of the merging theorem.

Lemma 4. *For $L\in\{1,...,d_A\}$, a set $\{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^{N}$ of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and $\psi_{ABE,i}$ a purification of $\rho_{AB,i}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ for each i, we have*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB},\mathcal{A}(v))\ dv \geq 1-2\left(\frac{L}{d_A}+2\cdot\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sqrt{L\cdot rank(\rho_{E,i})\|\rho_{B,i}\|_2^2}\right) \tag{20}$$

where the integration is with respect to the normalized Haar measure on $\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$.

To prove the claim of Lemma 4 the following two lemmas are needed.

Lemma 5 ([7], Lemma 3.2)**.** *Let L and D be $N\times N$-matrices with nonnegative entries such that*

$$L_{jl}\leq L_{jj},\ L_{jl}\leq L_{ll} \text{ and } D_{ij}\leq\max\{D_{ii},D_{jj}\}$$

for all $i,j\in\{1,...,N\}$. Then

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\frac{1}{N}\sqrt{L_{ij}D_{ij}}\leq 2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sqrt{L_{ii}D_{ii}}$$

Lemma 6. *Let τ and ξ be elements of a bipartite Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}'$. Then*

$$\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\tau\rangle\langle\xi|)\|_2^2\leq\max_{\chi\in\{\tau,\xi\}}\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|)\|_2^2$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_m\}_{m=1}^{d}$ in $\mathcal{H}'$ where $d:=\dim(\mathcal{H}')$. The elements φ and ψ can be decomposed in the form

$$\varphi=\sum_{m=1}^{d}\varphi_m\otimes e_m \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\psi=\sum_{m=1}^{d}\psi_m\otimes e_m$$

with suitable elements $\varphi_1,...,\varphi_d$ and $\psi_1,...,\psi_d$ in $\mathcal{H}$. With these decompositions

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|)=\sum_{m,n=1}^{d}|\varphi_m\rangle\langle\psi_n|\cdot\mathrm{tr}(|e_m\rangle\langle e_n|).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\psi|)\|_2^2 &= \|\sum_{m=1}^{d} |\varphi_m\rangle\langle\psi_m|\,\|_2^2 &(21)\\ &= |\mathrm{tr}\left(\sum_{m,n=1}^{d}(|\varphi_m\rangle\langle\psi_m|)^*(|\varphi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n|)\right)| &(22)\\ &= |\sum_{m,n=1}^{d}\langle\varphi_m,\varphi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n,\psi_m\rangle\,|. &(23)\end{aligned}$$

To show the assertion of the lemma consider hermitean $d\times d$ matrices X and Y with entries $X_{mn} := \langle\varphi_m,\varphi_n\rangle$ resp. $Y_{mn} := \overline{\langle\psi_m,\psi_n\rangle}$ for $0 < m, n \le d$. Then the RHS of (23) can be read as $\mathrm{tr}(XY)$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\sum_{m,n=1}^{d}\langle\varphi_m\varphi_n\rangle\langle\psi_n,\psi_m\rangle\,| &= |\mathrm{tr}(XY)|\\ &\le \|X\|_2\|Y\|_2 &(24)\\ &\le \max_{Z\in\{X,Y\}}\|Z\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the RHS of (24) is an application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It is easy to see that $\|X\|_2^2 = \|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|)\|_2^2$ and $\|Y\|_2^2 = \|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}'}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\|_2^2$, so we are done. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4. First we have to convince ourselves, that $F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \mathcal{A}(\cdot))$ depends measurably on $v \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. For each fixed set $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k=0}^{D}$, the function $F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \sum_{k=1}^{D}\mathcal{A}_k\circ\mathcal{V}\otimes\mathcal{U}_k)$ clearly is continuous in v, therefore, $F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \mathcal{A}(v))$ as a maximum over such functions is lower semicontinous, which implies its measurability.
Using Lemma 3 we get

$$F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \mathcal{A}(v)) \ge 1 - Q_v$$

with error

$$Q_v := 2\left(p_0^v + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{D}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\sqrt{L_{ij}\cdot T_{ij,v}^{(k)}}\right).$$

Here $p_0^v := \mathrm{tr}((\mathcal{A}_0\circ\mathcal{V})(\rho_A))$,

$$T_{ij,v}^{(k)} := \left\|\rho_{AE,ij,v}^{k} - \tfrac{L}{d_A}\pi_L\otimes\rho_{E,ij}\right\|_2^2$$

and

$$\rho_{AE,ij,v}^{k} := \mathcal{A}_k\circ\mathcal{V}(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(\psi_{ABE,ij})).$$

By virtue of Jensen's inequality

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} Q_v\,dv \le 2\left(\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} p_0^v\,dv + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{D}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}(L_{ij}\cdot\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} T_{ij,v}^{(k)}\,dv)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$

holds. It remains to bound the expectations in the right hand side of the above inequality. This was already done in Lemma 6 of [18]. We have

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} T^k_{ij,v}\, dv \le \frac{L^2}{d_A^2}\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}(|\psi_{ABE,i}\rangle\langle\psi_{ABE,j}|)\|_2^2, \quad \text{and} \qquad \int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} p_0^v\, dv \le \frac{L}{d_A}. \tag{25}$$

Abbreviating $D_{ij} := \|\mathrm{tr}_B(|\psi_{ABE,i}\rangle\langle\psi_{ABE,j}|)\|_2^2$ for every $i, j \in [N]$, (25) implies

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} Q_v\, dv \le 2\left(\frac{L}{d_A} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{D}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\sqrt{L_{ij}\cdot\frac{L^2}{d_A^2}D_{ij}}\right) \tag{26}$$

$$\le 2\left(\frac{L}{d_A} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\sqrt{L_{ij}D_{ij}}\right). \tag{27}$$

The second inequality follows from the fact that the summands on the RHS of (26) are independent of k and $D\frac{L}{d_A} \le 1$ by definition of D. By definition of L_{ij}, clearly $L_{ij} = \min\{L_{ii}, L_{jj}\}$ for all i, j and so the first assumption of Lemma 5 is fulfilled. The second assumption (i.e. $D_{ij} \le \max\{D_{ii}, D_{jj}\}$) holds by Lemma 6. Using Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)} Q_v\, dv \le 2\left(\frac{L}{d_A} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sqrt{L\cdot\mathrm{rank}(\rho_{E,i})\|\rho_{B,i}\|_2^2}\right).$$

Note that we replaced $\|\rho_{AE,i}\|_2$ by $\|\rho_{B,i}\|_2$ for every i, which is admissible, because they are complementary marginals of a pure state [5]. $\square$

Corollary 2. *Lemma 4 provides the desired bound on the worst-case merging fidelity for finite sets. If we choose* $\mathcal{M}$ *to be composed of the L-instrument* $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{v})$ *for some* $\tilde{v}$ *which fulfills the bound on the right hand side of (20), and* $\{\mathcal{U}_k\}_{k=1}^{D}$ *which is a maximizer realizing* $F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \mathcal{A}(\tilde{v}))$ *for* $\tilde{v}$ *(see eq. (19)), we have*

$$F_m(\overline{\rho}_{AB}, \mathcal{M}) \ge 1 - 2\left(\frac{L}{d_A} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sqrt{L\cdot \mathit{rank}(\rho_{E,i})\|\rho_{B,i}\|_2^2}\right)$$

which implies, together with the convexity property of F_m *(see Lemma 1),*

$$\min_{i\in[N]} F_m(\rho_{AB,i}, \mathcal{M}) \ge 1 - 2N\left(\frac{L}{d_A} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sqrt{L\cdot \mathit{rank}(\rho_{E,i})\|\rho_{B,i}\|_2^2}\right).$$

4 Proof of the merging theorem

4.1 Typical subspaces

Here we state some properties of frequency typical projections which will be needed in the achievability proof. The concept of typicality is standard in classical and quantum information theory. Therefore we provide just the needed properties which can be found (along with basic definitions) in [7] (see [9] for the properties of types and typical sequences).

Lemma 7. *There exists a real number* $c > 0$ *such that for every Hilbert space* $\mathcal{H}$ *of dimension* d *the following holds: For any state* ρ *on* $\mathcal{H}$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ *and* $l \in \mathbb{N}$ *there is a projection* $q_{\delta,l} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l})$ *(its so-called* frequency typical projection) *with*

1. $\mathrm{tr}(q_{\delta,l}\rho^{\otimes l}) \geq 1 - 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}$

2. $q_{\delta,l}\rho^{\otimes l}q_{\delta,l} \leq 2^{-l(S(\rho)-\varphi(\delta))}q_{\delta,l}$

3. $2^{l(S(\rho)-\varphi(\delta)-h(l))} \leq \mathit{rank}(q_{\delta,l}) \leq 2^{l(S(\rho)+\varphi(\delta))}$

where the functions $\varphi(\delta) \to 0$ for $\delta \to 0$ and $h(l) \to \infty$ for $l \to \infty$. Explicitly they are given by

$$h(l) = \frac{d}{l}\log(d+1) \quad \mathit{and} \quad \varphi(\delta) = -\delta \log \frac{\delta}{d}$$

for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

4.2 Proof of the direct part in case of finite sets of states

In this section we prove the optimal merging rate theorem using our one-shot result from Lemma 4. We first consider a finite set $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ with purifications $\psi_{ABE,1}, ..., \psi_{ABE,N} \in \mathcal{H}_{ABE}$. For these states we introduce some sort of "typical reductions". We define

$$\tilde{\psi}^l_{ABE,i,\delta} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_{i,\delta,l}}}\tilde{q}^l_{i,\delta}\psi^{\otimes l}_{ABE,i},$$

where $w_{i,\delta,l} := \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{q}^l_{i,\delta}\psi^{\otimes l}_{ABE,i})$,

$$\tilde{\rho}^l_{B,i,\delta} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_{AE}}(\tilde{\psi}^l_{ABE,i,\delta}), \text{ and } \quad \tilde{\rho}^l_{E,i,\delta} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_{AB}}(\tilde{\psi}^l_{ABE,i,\delta}).$$

for all $i \in \{1, ..., N\}, l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Here $\tilde{q}^l_{i,\delta}$ is given by the typical projectors $q_{A,i}$, $q_{B,i}$ and $q_{E,i}$ of the corresponding marginals of $\psi_{ABE,i}$

$$\tilde{q}_i := q_{A,i} \otimes q_{B,i} \otimes q_{E,i}$$

(here and in the following, the indices δ, l, i are sometimes omitted for the sake of brevity). The following lemma provides some bounds needed later

Lemma 8. *With the definitions given above, we have*

1. $w_{i,\delta,l} \geq 1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}$

2. $\|\tilde{\rho}^l_{B,i,\delta}\|_2 \leq w^{-1}_{i,\delta,l}2^{-\frac{l}{2}(S(\rho_{B,i})-3\varphi(\delta)-h(l))}$

3. $\mathit{rank}(\tilde{\rho}^l_{E,i,\delta}) \leq 2^{l(S(\rho_{AB,i})+\varphi(\delta))}$

for all $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note, that the functions φ and h in Lemma 7 depend on the dimensions of the individual Hilbert space, however the above lemma clearly holds if we take the functions φ and h in Lemma 7 with $d = \dim(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$.

Proof. 1.) Some simple algebra shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{q} &= \mathbb{1}_{ABE} - q_A \otimes q_B^{\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E - q_A^{\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B \otimes q_E \\ &\quad - \mathbb{1}_A \otimes q_B \otimes q_E^{\perp} - q_A^{\perp} \otimes q_B^{\perp} \otimes q_E^{\perp} \\ &\geq \mathbb{1}_{ABE} - q_A^{\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BE} - \mathbb{1}_A \otimes q_B^{\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_E \\ &\quad - 2(\mathbb{1}_{AB} \otimes q_E^{\perp})\end{aligned}$$

holds. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} w_{i,\delta,l} &= \operatorname{tr}(\tilde{q}_i \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}) && (28)\\ &\geq 1 - \operatorname{tr}(q_{A,i}^{\perp} \rho_{A,i}^{\otimes l}) - \operatorname{tr}(q_{B,i}^{\perp} \rho_{A,i}^{\otimes l}) - 2\operatorname{tr}(q_{E,i}^{\perp} \rho_{A,i}^{\otimes l}) && (29)\\ &\geq 1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-(c\delta^2 - h(l))}. && (30) \end{aligned}$$

2.) We first show, that

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}}(\tilde{q}^l \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l} \tilde{q}^l)^2\right) \leq \operatorname{tr}\left((q_B^l \rho_B^{\otimes l} q_B^l)^2\right) \tag{31}$$

holds. Note, that

$$\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left((q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^l)\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}(q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^l)\right) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left((q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes q_E^l)\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right). \tag{32}$$

Additionally, we have $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left((q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^l)\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right) \leq \rho_B^{\otimes l}$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_B^{\otimes l} - \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left((q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^l)\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right) &= \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left(q_A^{l\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^l \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right)\\ &\quad + \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left(q_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^{l\perp} \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right)\\ &\quad + \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}\left(q_A^{l\perp} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes q_E^{l\perp} \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where all of the summands on the RHS are nonnegative operators. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}(\tilde{q}_{i,\delta}^l \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l} \tilde{q}_{i,\delta}^l)^2\right) &= \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(q_B^l \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}(p_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes p_E^l \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}) q_B\right)^2\right)\\ &\leq \operatorname{tr}\left((q_B^l \rho_B^{\otimes l} q_B^l)(q_B^l \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}(p_A^l \otimes \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}_B} \otimes p_E^l \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}) q_B^l)\right)\\ &\leq \operatorname{tr}\left((q_B^l \rho_B^{\otimes l} q_B^l)^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

which proves eq. (31). The above inequalities rely on the fact, that $\operatorname{tr}(A(\cdot))$ and $q_B^l(\cdot)q_B^l$ are positive maps, if A is a nonnegative operator. Finally we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\rho}_{B,i,\delta}^l\|_2^2 &= w_{i,\delta,l}^{-2} \operatorname{tr}\left(\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}}(\tilde{q}_{i,\delta}^l \psi_{ABE,i,\delta}^{\otimes l} \tilde{q}_{i,\delta}^l)^2\right)\\ &\leq w_{i,\delta,l}^{-2} \operatorname{tr}\left((q_{B,i,\delta}^l \rho_{B,i,\delta}^{\otimes l} q_{B,i,\delta}^l)^2\right) && (33)\\ &\leq w_{i,\delta,l}^{-2} \operatorname{tr}(q_{B,i,\delta}^l) \cdot 2^{-2l(S(\rho_{B,i}) - \varphi(\delta))} && (34)\\ &\leq w_{i,\delta,l}^{-2} 2^{-l(S(\rho_{B,i}) - 3\varphi(\delta))} \end{aligned}$$

where the RHS of eq. (33) follows from (31), and (34) results from Lemma 7.2 applied twice. The last of the above inequalities follows from Lemma 7.3 .
3.) follows from the third claim in Lemma 7 and the fact that $S(\rho_{AB,i}) = S(\rho_{E,i})$. ☐

Theorem 3. *For a finite collection $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ it holds*

$$C_m(\mathcal{X}) \leq \max_{i \in \{1,\dots,N\}} S(A|B; \rho_{AB,i}).$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the corresponding one in [18], but uses the one-shot bound given in Lemma 4. We show, that the for every $\epsilon > 0$, the number $\max_{i \in [N]} S(A|B; \rho_{AB,i}) + \epsilon$ is an achievable rate for a merging of $\mathcal{X}$. First assume, that $\max_{i \in [N]} S(A|B; \rho_{AB,i}) < 0$. Let $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ such that $\frac{\epsilon}{5} < \varphi(\delta)$. It suffices to consider ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < |\max_{1<i\leq N} S(A|B, \rho_{AB,i})|$. Define

$$L_l := \lfloor 2^{-l(\max_{i \in [N]} S(A|B; \rho_{AB,i}) + \epsilon)} \rfloor.$$

According to Lemma 4 along with Corollary 2, there is an L_l-merging $\mathcal{M}_l$ which fulfills

$$\min_{i\in[N]} F(\mathcal{M}_l \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\tilde{\psi}^l_{ABE,i,\delta}), \phi_{L_l} \otimes \tilde{\psi}^l_{B'BE,i,\delta}) \geq 1 - NQ$$

with

$$Q := 2\left(\frac{L_l}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l})} + 2\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sqrt{L_l \cdot \operatorname{rank}(\tilde{\rho}^l_{E,i,\delta}) \|\tilde{\rho}^l_{B,i,\delta}\|_2^2}\right). \tag{35}$$

With help of Lemma 8 it is easy to bound the summands on the RHS of eq. (35). Explicitly it holds

$$\frac{L_l}{\dim(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l})} \leq \frac{L_l}{\operatorname{tr}(q_{A,i})} \leq 2^{-6l\varphi(\delta)},$$

$$\sqrt{L_l \cdot \operatorname{rank}(\tilde{\rho}^l_{E,i,\delta}) \|\tilde{\rho}^l_{B,i,\delta}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{2^{-\frac{l}{2}\varphi(\delta)}}{1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}}.$$

Therefore

$$\min_{i\in[N]} F(\mathcal{M}_l \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\tilde{\psi}^l_{ABE,i,\delta}), \phi_{L_l} \otimes \tilde{\psi}^l_{B'BE,i,\delta}) \geq 1 - \tilde{f}(l, N, \delta)$$

holds, where

$$\tilde{f}(l, N, \delta) := 2N\left(2^{-6l\varphi(\delta)} + 2N\frac{2^{-\frac{l}{2}\varphi(\delta)}}{1 - 4 \cdot 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}}\right) \tag{36}$$

for $l, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. The desired bound for the merging fidelity of the original set $\mathcal{X}$ of states follows from Winter's gentle measurement Lemma (cf. [25], Lemma 9). Explicitly, it holds

$$\min_{i\in[N]} F(\rho_{AB,i}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}_l) \geq 1 - f(l, N, \delta). \tag{37}$$

where $f(l, N, \delta) := 2\sqrt{\tilde{f}(l, N, \delta)} - 2\sqrt{32 \cdot 2^{-l(c\delta^2 - h(l))}}$. It remains to consider the case $\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,N\}} S(A|B; \rho_{AB,i}) \geq 0$. The above argument can be used with additional assistance of a sufficient amount of entanglement shared by the merging partners. Let ϕ_K be a maximally entangled state shared by A and B of Schmidt rank $K := 2^{\lceil \max_{i\in[N]} S(A|B,\rho_{AB,i})\rceil + 1}$ then for every i the state

$$\phi_K \otimes \rho_{AB,i}$$

has negative conditional von Neumann entropy. Therefore the above argument holds for these states giving an L_l-merging $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_l$ with

$$L_l = 2^{-l(\max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(A|B,\rho_{AB,i}) - \lceil \max_{i\in[N]} S(A|B,\rho_{AB,i})\rceil - 1 + \epsilon)} \tag{38}$$

and $\min_{i\in[N]} F_m((\phi_K \otimes \rho_{AB,i})^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}_l)$ is lower bounded by a function as on the RHS of eq. (37). Some unitaries, resorting the bases do the rest. Because

$$\frac{1}{l}\log\left(\frac{K^l}{L_l}\right) = \max_{i\in[N]} S(A|B, \rho_{AB,i}) + \epsilon + o(l^0) \tag{39}$$

we are done $\square$

4.3 Proof of the direct part for arbitrary sets of states

In this section we aim to show that the achievability part of Theorem 1 does hold for any arbitrary set $\mathcal{X}$ of states as well. This can be achieved by approximating $\mathcal{X}$ by a sequence of (finite) nets and using the result obtained in the previous sections. The argument parallels the one given in case of general compound quantum channels in [8].
A τ-net in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ is a finite set $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$ such that for each state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$ there is at least one $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$ with $\|\rho - \rho_i\|_1 < \tau$. We find such a finite set for every $\tau > 0$ due to compactness of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$. For our proof we have to ensure, that we find τ-nets with cardinality upper bounded in an appropriate sense. This is the claim of the next lemma, which is a special case of Lemma 2.6 in [20].

Lemma 9. *For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ there is a τ-net $\{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$ in $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with cardinality*

$$N \leq \left(\frac{3}{\tau}\right)^{2d^2}$$

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as in [7] with the sets and norms replaced by the ones which are subject here □

Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be an arbitrary set of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. For a $\frac{\tau}{2}$-net $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\tau$, which fulfills the bound given in Lemma 9, i.e.

$$|\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\tau| \leq \left(\frac{6}{\tau}\right)^{2d_{AB}^2}$$

where $d_{AB} := \dim(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$, we define the set

$$\mathcal{X}_\tau := \{\rho_i \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}_\tau : \exists \rho \in \mathcal{X} \text{ with } \|\rho_i - \rho\|_1 < \frac{\tau}{2}\}. \tag{40}$$

The following lemma provides some statements concerning τ-nets needed later.

Lemma 10. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a set of bipartite states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ and $\mathcal{X}_\tau$, for $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{e}]$, the set defined in (40). It holds*

1. $|\mathcal{X}_\tau| \leq \left(\frac{6}{\tau}\right)^{2d_{AB}^2}$,
2. *For every $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ there is a state ρ_i in $\mathcal{X}_\tau$ satisfying*
$$\|\rho^{\otimes l} - \rho_i^{\otimes l}\|_1 < l \cdot \tau,$$
3. $|\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} S(A|B, \rho) - \max_{\rho_i \in \mathcal{X}_\tau} S(A|B, \rho_i)| \leq \tau + 2 \cdot \tau \log\left(\frac{d_{AB}}{\tau}\right)$, *and*
4. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be any merging operation for states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Then*
$$\min_{\rho_i \in \mathcal{X}_\tau} F_m(\rho_i^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \Rightarrow \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} F_m(\rho^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}) \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 4\sqrt{l \cdot \tau} \tag{41}$$

Proof. The first assertion is obvious from the definition of $\mathcal{X}_\tau$. The argument which proves the second one is exactly the same as done in [7] for channels. The third claim is a consequence of Fannes' inequality. Namely, to every positive real number τ we find states ρ' in $\mathcal{X}$ and ρ_i in $\mathcal{X}_\tau$ such that

$$\|\rho' - \rho_i\|_1 < \tau \tag{42}$$

and

$$S(A|B,\rho') \geq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) - \tau. \tag{43}$$

Eq. (42) implies

$$S(A|B,\rho') - S(A|B,\rho_i) \leq 2\tau \log\left(\frac{d_{AB}}{\tau}\right)$$

via an twofold application of Fannes inequality [13]. Therefore

$$\begin{align}
\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) - \tau &\leq S(A|B,\rho') \tag{44}\\
&\leq S(A|B,\rho_i) + 2\tau \log(\frac{d_{AB}}{\tau}). \tag{45}
\end{align}$$

which proves the assertion. To verify the last claim of the lemma we first fix a purification corresponding to every member of $\mathcal{X}_\tau$ (remember that we are free in our choice of the purifications). Let $\psi_{ABE,i}$ be a purification of $\rho_{AB,i}$ on $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Let ρ_{AB} an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{X}$, then we find at least one element of $\mathcal{X}_\tau$ satisfying

$$\|\rho_{AB,i} - \rho_{AB}\|_1 < \tau. \tag{46}$$

As a consequence of Uhlmann's theorem, there exists a purification ψ_{ABE} of ρ_{AB} on $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ such that

$$F(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes l}, \rho_{AB,i}^{\otimes l}) = F(\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}, \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}). \tag{47}$$

Now let ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 the maximally entangled input and output states associated with $\mathcal{M}$, then

$$\begin{align}
&F_m(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}) \tag{48}\\
&= F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}), \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}) \tag{49}\\
&\geq 1 - \|\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}) - \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}\|_1 \tag{50}
\end{align}$$

where the last inequality follows from the bound given in eq. (8). By an applications of the triangle inequality, the trace distance on the RHS of eq. (50) is upper bounded by

$$\begin{align}
\|\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}) - \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}\|_1 \leq &\|\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}) - \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l}\|_1 \nonumber\\
&+ \|\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes (\psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l} - \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}))\|_1 \nonumber\\
&+ \|\phi_1 \otimes (\psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l} - \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l})\|_1. \tag{51}
\end{align}$$

By monotonicity of the trace distance under the use of channels and eq. (46), each of the two last summands can be upper bounded by $\|\psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l} - \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\|_1$, and

$$\begin{align}
\|\psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l} - \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}\|_1 &\leq 2\sqrt{1 - F(\rho_{AB,i}^{\otimes l}, \rho_{AB}^{\otimes l})} \tag{52}\\
&\leq 2\sqrt{\|\rho_{AB,i}^{\otimes l} - \rho_{AB}^{\otimes l}\|_1} \nonumber\\
&\leq 2\sqrt{l\tau} \tag{53}
\end{align}$$

holds. Eq. (52) is justified by (47) along with the relation given in eq. (9), and (53) is by the second claim of the present lemma. The first summand is upper bounded by

$$\|\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_0 \otimes \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}) - \phi_1 \otimes \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \tag{54}$$

again with eq. (9) and the assumptions. Eqns. (51), (53) and (54) justify

$$\inf_{\rho_{AB}\in\mathcal{X}} F_m(\rho_{AB}^{\otimes l},\mathcal{M}) \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{\epsilon} - 4\sqrt{l\tau} \tag{55}$$

□

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{X}\subset\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be an arbitrary set of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. The merging cost of $\mathcal{X}$ is bounded from above by*

$$C_m(\mathcal{X}) \leq \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho). \tag{56}$$

Proof. We show that

$$\sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) + \epsilon$$

is an achievable rate for every ϵ satisfying $0 < \epsilon < |\sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho)|$. Fix $\tau\in(0,\frac{1}{e})$ for the moment and consider the corresponding set $\mathcal{X}_\tau$ given in (40) which approximates $\mathcal{X}$. According to the proof of Theorem 3 we find, for l large enough, an (l,k_l)-merging with

$$\begin{aligned} k_l &\leq 2^{l(\max_{1\leq i\leq N_\tau} S(A|B,\rho_i)+\epsilon)} \\ &\leq 2^{l(\sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho)+\epsilon+\tau+2\tau\log\frac{\dim(\mathcal{H}_{AB})}{\tau})}, \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

where the second inequality is from Lemma 10. Another consequence of Lemma 10 is the inequality

$$\inf_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} F_m(\rho^{\otimes l},\mathcal{M}_l) \geq 1 - 2\sqrt{f(l,N_\tau,\delta)} - 4\sqrt{l\cdot\tau}. \tag{58}$$

If we now choose a sequence $\{\tau_l\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{l\to\infty}\tau_l = 0$ and $\lim_{\to\infty}\sqrt{l\cdot\tau_l} = 0$ and N_{τ_l} growing polynomially (which is possible because Lemma 9 holds), then (57) and (58) show that $\sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho)+\epsilon$ is achievable. □

4.4 Proof of the converse part

Because we have shown that any rate above the least upper bound of the entanglement costs of the members of $\mathcal{X}$ achievable, our converse follows immediately from the original converse for single states from [18]. The argument given there is based on the fact that entanglement measures must be monotone under LOCC operations along with an application of Fannes' inequality. As the proof is carried out in detail there, we just extend the argument to our present case.
Let $\delta > 0$ and χ_{AB} a member of $\mathcal{X}$ which satisfies

$$S(A|B,\chi_{AB}) \geq \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) - \delta. \tag{59}$$

Following the argument of the single state converse, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{l}\log(k_l) &\geq S(A|B,\chi_{AB}) - g(l)2\sqrt{\epsilon}(1-\log(2\sqrt{\epsilon})) \\ &= \sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) - \delta - g(l)2\sqrt{\epsilon}(1-\log(2\sqrt{\epsilon})) \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

with a function g which is O(1) for $l \to \infty$. Therefore the entanglement cost of $\mathcal{X}$ is least $\sup_{\rho\in\mathcal{X}} S(A|B,\rho) - \delta$ for every $\delta > 0$.

5 Classical communication cost of state merging

Having determined the optimal entanglement cost of a state merging process, we consider the classical cost of state merging in this section. By classical cost, we mean the rate of classical communication from A to B, which is at least required for an asymptotically perfect merging process. More precisely, if $\{\mathcal{M}_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ is a merging for a set $\mathcal{X}$, where A distinguishes D_l measurement outcomes (see Section 2, eq. (2)) within the application of $\mathcal{M}_l$, the classical cost is given by

$$R_c = \limsup_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l} \lceil \log D_l \rceil.$$

In case of a single state ρ_{AB}, the minimum rate of classical communication for protocols achieving entanglement rate $R_q = S(A|B, \rho_{AB})$ was determined in [18] as $R_c = I(A;E,\rho_{AE})$, where ρ_{AE} is the marginal on the subsystems belonging to A and E of an arbitrary purification ψ_{ABE} of ρ_{AB}. In this section we deal with the case of a set of states to be merged and for the sake of simplicity, we restrict ourselves to finite sets of states. Clearly, the classical communication cost for a merging procedure for a set $\mathcal{X}$ of states is lower bounded by the maximum of the communication costs for the individual states in $\mathcal{X}$. This is a direct consequence of the known result for single states, which was given in [18]. The original proof given there is based on properties of the closely related "mother protocol" [1] and general assertions within the resource framework from [12]. Here, we give a more elementary proof for the reader not familiar with the results of [12],[1]. Moreover, this result and a converse statement for the case that A and B are restricted to L-mergings show, that the protocol class we considered to show achievability of the merging cost, is suboptimal regarding the classical cost.

Proposition 5 (cf. [18], Theorem 8)**.** *Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a bipartite state with purification ψ_{ABE} on a space $\mathcal{H}_{ABE}$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. If $\mathcal{M}(\cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k(\cdot)$ is a merging with $A \to B$ forward classical communication for states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes l}$ with*

$$F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_K \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}) \geq 1-\epsilon \tag{61}$$

holds with maximally entangled state ϕ_K, ϕ_L of Schmidt rank K resp. L, then

$$\frac{1}{l}\log(D) \geq I(A;E,\rho_{AE}) - 6\sqrt{\epsilon}\left(\frac{1}{l}\log(KL) + \log\dim\mathcal{H}_{AB}\right) - 3\eta(2\sqrt{\epsilon}) \tag{62}$$

holds, where the function η is defined on $[0,1]$ by

$$\eta(x) := \begin{cases} -x\log x & 0 < x \leq \frac{1}{e} \\ \frac{\log e}{e} & \frac{1}{e} < x \leq 1 \end{cases} \tag{63}$$

and $\eta(0) := 0$.

Proof. The proof is inspired by ideas from [16]. Fix $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\phi_K \in \mathcal{K}_{AB}^0$ and $\phi_L \in \mathcal{K}_{AB}^1$ maximally entangled input resp. output states of the protocol such that with notations

$$\psi_0 := \phi_K \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}, \text{ and } \quad \psi_1 := \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}$$

eq. (61) reads

$$F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0), \psi_1) \geq 1-\epsilon. \tag{64}$$

We use the abbreviations $\mathcal{H}_{BE}^0 := \mathcal{K}_B^0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{BE}^{\otimes l}$, $p_k := \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}^0}(\psi_0))$ for $k \in [D]$, and $T = \{k \in [D] : p_k \neq 0\}$. For the von Neumann entropy it is known, that it is almost convex, i.e. for a state $\overline{\rho}$ defined as a mixture $\overline{\rho} := \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i \rho_i$ of quantum states,

$$S(\overline{\rho}) \geq H(p_1, ..., p_N) + \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_i S(\rho_i)$$

holds, where $H(p_1, ..., p_N)$ is the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution on $[N]$ given by $p_1, ..., p_N$. Using this fact, we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \log D &\geq H(p_1, ..., p_D) \\ &\geq S\left(\sum_{k\in T} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) - \sum_{k\in T} p_k S\left(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

on $\log D$. We separately bound the terms on the RHS of eq. (65). With definitions $\pi_{K,A} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}^0_B}(\phi_K)$, $\pi_{K,B} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}^0_A}(\phi_K)$ and $\pi_{L,A} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}^1_B}(\phi_L)$ (these are maximally mixed states of rank K resp. L) and $\mathcal{A}(\cdot) := \sum_{k\in T} \mathcal{A}_k(\cdot)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(\sum_{k\in T} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) &\geq S(\pi_{K,B} \otimes \rho_{BE}^{\otimes l}) - S(\mathcal{A}(\pi_{K,A} \otimes \rho_A^{\otimes l})) && (66) \\ &\geq \log K + lS(\rho_{BE}) - \log L - \Delta_1(\epsilon) && (67) \\ &= \log \frac{K}{L} - lS(\rho_A) - \Delta_1(\epsilon) && (68) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_1(\cdot) := 2\sqrt{\cdot}\log(L) + \eta(2\sqrt{\cdot})$. Here eq. (66) is by the Araki-Lieb inequality [5], and eq. (68) is due to the fact that $S(\rho_A) = S(\rho_{BE})$ holds. Eq. (67) is justified as follows. Using the relation between fidelity and trace distance from (9) along with the fact, that the latter is monotone under taking partial traces, (64) implies

$$\|\mathcal{A}(\pi_{K,A} \otimes \rho_A^{\otimes l}) - \pi_{L,A}\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}. \tag{69}$$

This, via application of Fannes' inequality leads to

$$S(\mathcal{A}(\pi_{K,A} \otimes \rho_A^{\otimes l})) \leq S(\pi_{L,A}) - 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\log L - \eta(2\sqrt{\epsilon}), \tag{70}$$

where η is the function defined in (63). To bound the second term on the RHS of (65), we use Stinespring extensions of the individual trace decreasing channels which constitute $\mathcal{M}$. Let

$$v_k : \mathcal{K}^0_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l} \to \mathcal{K}^1_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C'}$$

be a Stinespring extension of $\mathcal{A}_k$ and

$$u_k : \mathcal{K}^0_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l} \to \mathcal{K}^1_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B'B}^{\otimes l} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C''} \tag{71}$$

be a Stinespring extension of $\mathcal{B}_k$ for every $k \in [D]$. Here $\mathcal{H}_{C'}$ is a Hilbert space associated to A and $\mathcal{H}_{C''}$ belongs to B. We fix notations $\mathcal{V}_k(\cdot) := v_k(\cdot)v_k^*$ and $\mathcal{U}_k := u_k(\cdot)u_k^*$ and denote the normalized outputs of these extensions by

$$\gamma_k := \frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{V}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0) \tag{72}$$

for every $k \in T$. Note that $\mathcal{V}_1, ..., \mathcal{V}_D$ are trace decreasing, while $\mathcal{U}_1, ..., \mathcal{U}_D$ are channels. For every $k \in T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(\tfrac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) &= S\left(\tfrac{1}{p_k}\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\mathcal{V}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) \\ &= S\left(\tfrac{1}{p_k}\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\mathcal{V}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0)\right) \\ &= S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\gamma_k), \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the second equality is by the fact that u_k is an isometry and consequently the action of $\mathcal{U}_k$ does does not change the entropy. Note, that (64) implies, because fidelity is linear in the first input here, existence of a positive number c_k for every $k \in T$, such that

$$F\left(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0), \psi_1\right) = 1 - c_k \tag{74}$$

and $\sum_{k\in T}^{D} p_k c_k \leq \epsilon$ hold. Because γ_k is a purification of $\frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0)$ and ψ_1 is already pure, Uhlmann's Theorem ensures existence of a pure state φ_k on $\mathcal{H}_{C'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C''}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} F(\gamma_k, \psi_1 \otimes \varphi_k) &= \max\{|\langle \gamma_k, \sigma\rangle|^2 : \sigma \text{ purification of } \psi_0 \text{ on } \mathcal{K}^1_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_{B'BE} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C'} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C''}\} \\ &= F(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0), \psi_1) \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

for every $k \in T$. From eqns. (74) and (75) we conclude, again via the well known relation between fidelity and trace distance from (9),

$$\|\gamma_k - \psi_1 \otimes \varphi_k\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{c_k}, \tag{76}$$

which implies, again via Fannes' inequality and monotonicity of the trace distance under partial tracing

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\gamma_k) &\leq S(\psi_1 \otimes \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k) + \Delta_2(c_k) \\ &\leq S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k) + \Delta_2(c_k). \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

where $\Delta_2(\cdot) = 2\sqrt{\cdot}\log(\dim \mathcal{H}^2_{AB} \dim \mathcal{H}_{C''}) + \eta(2\sqrt{\cdot})$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k\in T} p_k S\left(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}^0_{BE}}(\psi_0)\right) &= \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\gamma_k) \\ &\leq \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k) + \Delta_2(\epsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

The above equality is by (73), the inequality follows by (77) and the fact, that that Δ_2 is monotone and concave (see the definition of η in 63)). It remains to bound $\sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k)$. Abbreviating $\mathcal{H}^1_{AE} := \mathcal{K}^1_A \otimes \mathcal{H}^{\otimes l}_E \otimes \mathcal{H}_{C'}$, an argument very similar to the one above gives (again via (76) and an application of Fannes' inequality) the bound

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^1_{AE}}(\gamma_k)) &\geq S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^1_{AE}}(\psi_1 \otimes \varphi_k)) - \Delta_3(c_k) \\ &= S(\pi_{L,B} \otimes \rho^{\otimes l}_{B'B} \otimes \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k) - \Delta_3(c_k) \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

with the function $\Delta_3(\cdot) := 2\sqrt{\cdot}(\log(K) + l\log(\dim \mathcal{H}_{AB} \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_{C''})) + 2\eta(\sqrt{\cdot})$. And, using monotonicity and concavity of Δ_3 together with (79), we obtain

$$\sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}^1_{AE}}(\gamma_k)) \geq \log(L) + lS(\rho_{AB}) + \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}}\varphi_k) - \Delta_3(\epsilon) \tag{80}$$

where we used, that $S(\rho_{B'B}) = S(\rho_{AB})$ holds. If we now look at $\sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{V}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\cdot)$ as an one-way LOCC-channel with local operations on systems belonging to A and E on one side and B on the other side which transformes the pure input state ψ_0 to the state described by the pure state mixture $\sum_{k\in T} p_k\gamma_k$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(\pi_K \otimes \rho_B^{\otimes l}) &= S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}_A^0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{AE}^{\otimes l}} \psi_0) \\
&= S\left(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^1}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{V}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}^0}(\psi_0)\right)\right) \\
&\geq \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^1} \mathcal{V}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}^0}(\psi_0)) \\
&= \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\frac{1}{p_k}\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^1} \mathcal{V}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0)) \qquad (81)\\
&= \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{AE}^1} \gamma_k). \qquad (82)
\end{aligned}
$$

The second of the above equalities is due to the fact, that $\sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{V}_k(\cdot)$ is trace preserving, the inequality is by concavity of the von Neumann entropy. Eq. (81) is because the von Neumann entropy is not changed by application of unitary channels in the input. The last equality is by the definitions introduced in (72) With (80), (82) and the equality $S(\rho_{AB}) = S(\rho_E)$, we obtain

$$S(\pi_K \otimes \rho_B^{\otimes l}) \geq \log(L) + lS(\rho_E) + \sum_{k\in T} p_k S(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{C'}} \varphi_k) - \Delta_3(\epsilon). \qquad (83)$$

Rearranging the terms in inequality (83) and using (78) leads to the bound

$$\sum_{k\in T} p_k S\left(\tfrac{1}{p_k}\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_{BE}^0}(\psi_0)\right) \leq \log\frac{K}{L} + l(S(\rho_{AE}) - S(\rho_E)) + \Delta_2(\epsilon) + \Delta_3(\epsilon). \qquad (84)$$

Here, we additionally used the fact, that $S(\rho_B) = S(\rho_{AE})$ holds. Combining the bounds from (67) and (84) with (65), we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{l}\log D \geq I(A;E,\rho_{AE}) - \frac{1}{l}(\Delta_1(\epsilon) + \Delta_2(\epsilon) + \Delta_3(\epsilon)). \qquad (85)$$

In fact, we find Stinespring extensions on spaces $\mathcal{H}_{C'}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{C''}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathcal{H}_{C'} &= K \cdot L \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_A^l \qquad (86)\\
\dim \mathcal{H}_{C''} &= K \cdot L \cdot \dim \mathcal{H}_B^{2l} \dim \mathcal{H}_A^l. \qquad (87)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the definition of Δ_1, Δ_2 and Δ_3 with the above dimensions, we conclude

$$\frac{1}{l}\log D \geq I(A;E,\rho_{AE}) - 6(\sqrt{\epsilon}\frac{\log KL}{l} + \log\dim\mathcal{H}_{AB}) - 3\eta(2\sqrt{\epsilon}), \qquad (88)$$

which we aimed to prove. □

Remark 1. *It is worth noting here, that the lower bound for the classical cost established in the proof of Proposition 5 does not explicitly rely on the entanglement rate of the protocol. Consequently, there is no chance to significantly reduce the required classical communication by admitting a higher entanglement rate, as long as one demands the protocol to be asymptotically perfect.*

In contrast to the above result, the following lemma indicates the limitation of the class of protocols used for establishing the achivability of the merging cost.

Lemma 11. *Let* $\{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^{N}$ *be a set of states on* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$*. There exists a number* $l_0(\epsilon, \delta)$*, such that if* $l > l_0$ *and* $\mathcal{M}$ *an* $\mathcal{M}(\cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k(\cdot)$ *is an* L*-merging for states on* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}^{\otimes l}$ *for some* $L \in \{1, ..., \dim(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l})\}$ *with*

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F_m(\rho_{AB,i}^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{M}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \tag{89}$$

then

$$\frac{1}{l} \log(D) \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \frac{1}{l} \log \frac{K}{L} - \delta \tag{90}$$

Proof. First we consider for an arbitrary but fixed number $l \in \mathbb{N}$ an arbitrary single state ρ_{AB}. Let $M \subset [D]$ be a set of indices which fulfills

$$F\left(\sum_{k \in M} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\phi_K \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l}), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}\right) \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

We use abbreviations

$$\psi_0 := \phi_K \otimes \psi_{ABE}^{\otimes l} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_0 := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathcal{K}_B^0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{BE}^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0) = \pi_K \otimes \rho_A^{\otimes l}$$

Without any loss we assume that M contains no k with $\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0)) = 0$ holds. Because we are concerned with an L-merging for ψ_0 here, we have

$$\mathcal{A}_k(\cdot) = u_k p_k (\cdot) p_k u_k^*$$

for every k in M where $\{p_k\}_{k \in M}$ is a set of mutually orthogonal projections of rank L. We have

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0)) = \mathrm{tr}(p_k \rho_0),$$

and

$$\mathrm{tr}(q\rho_0) = \sum_{k \in M} \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k \rho_0), \tag{91}$$

where we used the definition $q := \sum_{k \in M} p_k$. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \epsilon &\leq \sum_{k \in M} F(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}}(\psi_0), \phi_L \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \in M} F(\mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0), \pi_L) \qquad (92) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \in M} \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k(\rho_0)) \qquad (93) \\
&= \mathrm{tr}(q\rho_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, (92) follows from monotonicity of the fidelity under partial traces, (93) by the fact that it is homogeneous in its inputs. The last equality is by (91). If we take l large enough, the well known fact, that subspaces of large probability, asymptotically, cannot have dimension substantially smaller than the typical subspace (see [9], Lemma 2.14) guarantees

$$\mathrm{tr}(q) \geq S(\rho_0) - \delta = S(\pi_K) + lS(\rho_A) - \delta \tag{94}$$

If we take into account, that q is a sum of $|M|$ mutually orthogonal projections of rank L, we have

$$\frac{1}{l}\log|M| \geq S(\rho_A) - \frac{1}{l}\log\frac{K}{L} - \delta. \tag{95}$$

If we now consider a set $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ and and repeat the above argument with sets $M_1, ..., M_N$ for this case we arrive at

$$\frac{1}{l}\log D \geq \frac{1}{l}\log\max_{1\leq i\leq N}|M_i| \geq \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) - \frac{1}{l}\log\frac{K}{L} - \delta \tag{96}$$

which concludes our proof. □

Theorem 6 (classical cost of L-merging)**.** *Let $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_{AB,i}\}_{i=1}^N$ be a set of bipartite states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. For a merging procedure, where A and B are restricted to L-mergings (together with adding some further input pure entanglement) and entanglement rate*

$$R_q = \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(A|B, \rho_{AB,i}) \tag{97}$$

is achieved, the optimal rate of classical communication is

$$R_c = \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \max_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i}).$$

Proof. The converse statement follows directly from Lemma 11. If $\{\mathcal{M}_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ is a merging which fulfills the assumptions of the Theorem, then

$$\lim_{l\to\infty} F(\mathcal{M}_l \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}^{\otimes l}(\phi_{K_l} \otimes \psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}), \phi_{L_l} \otimes \psi_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}) \geq 1 - o(l^0)$$

for every $i \in [N]$, and

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l}\log\left(\frac{K_l}{L_l}\right) = \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(A|B, \rho_{AB,i}) = \max_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i}) \tag{98}$$

hold. With (98) and Lemma 11 it follows

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l}\log(D_l) \geq \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \max_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i}).$$

To prove achievability, we step back to Section 4.2. Because A and B are using an L_l-merging for every l, the distinct number of measurement results A has to communicate to B is given by

$$D_l = \frac{\dim \mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}}{L_l},$$

see Sect. 3.2. The argument in section 4.2 shows, that the desired quantum rate can be achieved by choosing L-mergings for the mixtures

$$\overline{\rho}_{AB}^l := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\rho}_{AB,i}^l,$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_{AB,i}^l$ is the typically reduced state for $\phi_K \otimes \rho_{AB,i}$ for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. We can therefore assume $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}$ to be restricted to the support of $\tilde{\rho}_A^l$. Clearly, it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{rank}\overline{\rho}_A^l &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathrm{rank}\tilde{\rho}_{A,i}^l \\ &\leq N \cdot \max_{1\leq i\leq N} \mathrm{rank}\tilde{\rho}_{A,i}^l \\ &\leq N \cdot 2^{l(S(\pi_K \otimes \rho_{A,i}) + \delta)}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$D_l \leq \frac{N}{L_l} \cdot 2^{l(S(\pi_K)+\max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i})+\delta)} \tag{99}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{l}\log(D_l) &\leq \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \log\frac{1}{l}\left(\frac{K^l}{L_l}\right) + \frac{N}{l} + \frac{\delta}{l} \\ &= \max_{1\leq i\leq N} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \max_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i}) + o(l^0) \end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

where we used the equality $S(A|B, \rho_{AB,i}) = I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i})$ for every $i \in [N]$. □

The converse statement in the preceding Theorem is more strict than the one given in Lemma 5. The following example shows, that there are sets $\mathcal{X}$, where the optimal classical cost is surely not achieved by using L-mergings. But here, we achieve the desired classical rate just by simple modifications of the protocol.

Example 7. *Consider the set* $\{\rho_{AB,1}, \rho_{AB,2}\} \in \mathcal{H}_{AB}$ *consisting of two members* $\rho_{AB,1} = \phi_L$ *and* $\rho_{AB,2} = \pi_M \otimes \pi_M$*, where* ϕ_L *is a maximally entangled state of Schmidt rank* L *on a subspace of* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ *and* π_M *is the maximally mixed state. We assume, that* $L > M$ *and*

$$\mathrm{supp}(\rho_{A,1}) \perp \mathrm{supp}(\rho_{A,2}) \tag{101}$$

In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{i=1,2} I(A;E,\rho_{AE,i}) &= S(\rho_{A,2}) + I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,2}) && (102)\\ &< S(\rho_{A,1}) + I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,2}) && (103)\\ &= \max_{i=1,2} S(\rho_{A,i}) + \max_{i=1,2} I_c(A\rangle E, \rho_{AE,i}). && (104)\end{aligned}$$

Because orthogonality of the supports of the A-marginals holds by (101), A can perfectly distinguish his parts of the states (using one copy) and therefore get state knowledge. The rest is done by tracing out output entanglement to make both mergings have the same entanglement cost.

6 Applications

In this section we give some indications how the result obtained so far has impact on other problems in quantum Shannon theory. As an example we provide another achievability proof for the entanglement generating capacity of a compound quantum channel with uninformed users. The original proof (see [8]) was based on an one-shot result for entanglement transmission, a closely related concept (actually their capacities were shown to be equal). Here we follow another line of reasoning, namely we use the close correspondence between the task of distilling entanglement from bipartite sources and generating entanglement over quantum channels. To this end we prove a compound version of the so-called hashing bound which is known as a prominent lower bound on distillable entanglement for perfectly known states [11]. For convenience we restrict ourselves to the case of finite sets of states and finite compound channels. The results are easily generalized to arbitrary sets using approximation techniques as it was done in Sect. 4.3.

6.1 Entanglement distillation under state uncertainty

Following [11], we define a (l, k_l)-*protocol for one-way distillation* of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ as a combination of an instrument $\{\mathcal{A}_k\}_{k=1}^{D} \subset \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^l)$ and a set of quantum channels $\{\mathcal{B}_k\}_{k=1}^{D} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^l)$ of the form

$$\mathcal{T} = \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{B}_k,$$

such that $\dim(\mathcal{K}^l) = k_l$. For a set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ of states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ a nonnegative number R is an achievable (one-way) entanglement distillation rate, if there is a sequence $\{\mathcal{T}_l\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ of (l, k_l)-entanglement distillation protocols such that

1. $\liminf\limits_{l \to \infty} \frac{1}{l} \log(k_l) \geq R$
2. $\lim\limits_{l \to \infty} \inf\limits_{\rho \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathcal{T}_l(\rho^{\otimes l}), \phi_l) = 1$

where ϕ_l is a maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{K}^l \otimes \mathcal{K}^l$. The number

$$D_{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}) := \sup\{R : R \text{ achievable}\}.$$

is called the *(one way) entanglement capacity* of $\mathcal{X}$. The following lemma is a compound analogue to Theorem 3.1 in [11].

Lemma 12. *Let $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ be a (finite) set of bipartite states on $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. Then*

$$D_{\rightarrow}(\mathcal{X}) \geq - \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} S(A|B, \rho_i) \tag{105}$$

Proof. It suffices to consider the case of a set with $\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} S(A|B, \rho_i) < 0$, since rate 0 can always be achieved by using a trivial protocol which distills no entanglement at all. Let $\mathcal{M} := \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{U}_k$ be an L-merging for $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}), \phi_l \otimes \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l}) \geq 1 - \epsilon. \tag{106}$$

Then $\mathcal{T}(\cdot) := \sum_{k=1}^{D} \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{R}_k(\cdot)$ with $\mathcal{R}_k := \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_{B'BE}^{\otimes l}} \circ (\mathcal{U}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E^{\otimes l}})$ for every k is a one-way entanglement distillation protocol for $\mathcal{X}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & F(\mathcal{T}(\rho_i^{\otimes l}), \phi_l) \\ & \geq F(\mathcal{M} \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}), \phi_l \otimes \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l}) \\ & \geq \ 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq N$. Eq. (107) is justified by the fact that taking partial traces cannot decrease fidelity. Following the proof of Theorem 4, for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ we find an L_l-merging $\mathcal{M}_l$ for $\mathcal{X}$ such that

$$L_l \geq \lfloor 2^{-l(\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} S(A|B,\rho,i) + \epsilon + o(l^0))} \rfloor \tag{108}$$

and

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F(\mathcal{M}_l \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_E}(\psi_{ABE,i}^{\otimes l}), \phi_l \otimes \psi_{B'BE,i}^{\otimes l}) \geq 1 - o(l^0). \tag{109}$$

Eqns. (107) and (110) give

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F(\mathcal{T}_l(\rho_i^{\otimes l}), \phi_l) \geq 1 - o(l^0). \tag{110}$$

The achievability of $- \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} S(A|B, \rho_i)$ follows from (108) and (110). □

The above lemma provides the main building block for determining the one-way entanglement capacity for sets of states, which is done in the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *Let* $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$. *Then*

$$D_\to(\mathcal{X}) = \lim_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l} D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes l}) \tag{111}$$

with

$$D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}) := -\min_{\mathcal{T}} \max_{1\leq i\leq N} \sum_{j:\lambda_j^{(i)}\neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \rho_j^{(i)}) \tag{112}$$

where the minimization is over quantum instruments $\mathcal{T}$ *of the form* $\mathcal{T} := \{\mathcal{T}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ *on* $\mathcal{H}_A$ *with definitions*

$$\lambda_j^{(i)} := \operatorname{tr}(\mathcal{T}_j(\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{H}_B}\rho_i)) \ \text{ and } \ \rho_j^{(i)} := \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(i)}} \mathcal{T}_j \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_B}(\rho_i) \tag{113}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq J$ *and* $1 \leq i \leq N$ *with* $\lambda_j \neq 0$. *In fact, we can restrict ourselves to* $J \leq dim(\mathcal{H}_A)^2$ *(see [11]).*

Remark 2. *One easily verifies, that the limit in (111) exists. Clearly,*

$$D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes k}) + D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes l}) \leq D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes (k+l)}) \tag{114}$$

holds for any $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, *because if* $\mathcal{T}^{(k)}$ *and* $\mathcal{T}^{(l)}$ *are instruments on* $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes k}$ *resp.* $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}$, *then* $\mathcal{T}^{(k)} \otimes \mathcal{T}^{(l)}$ *is an instrument on* $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes(k+l)}$. *The rest is by Fekete's Lemma [14].*

Proof of Theorem 8. We begin with the direct part of the Theorem. Our proof parallels the one given in [11] for the single state case. However, for the direct part, we use Lemma 12 instead of the single state hashing bound. To prove achievability, let $\mathcal{T} := \{\mathcal{T}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ be any instrument on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $\mathcal{P} := \{\mathcal{P}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ a set of channels of the form

$$\mathcal{P}_j(\chi) := \chi \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_j| \tag{115}$$

for every $\chi \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ and $1 \leq j \leq J$, where $e_1, ..., e_J$ are members of an orthonormal basis of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{B'}$ located at B's site. Define states

$$\tilde{\rho}_i := \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{T}_j \otimes \mathcal{P}_j(\rho_i) = \sum_{j,\lambda_j^{(i)}\neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} \rho_j^{(i)} \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_j|$$

for $1 \leq i \leq N$. These preprocessed states have conditional von Neumann entropy

$$S(A|BB', \tilde{\rho}_i) = \sum_{j:\lambda_j^{(i)}\neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \rho_j^{(i)}).$$

Direct application of Lemma 12 gives achievability. The converse statement can be proven just by the same arguments as given in [11], we give the proof for convenience. We consider an arbitrary (l, k_l) one-way distillation protocol with rate R, given by a LOCC channel with $A \to B$ classical communication

$$\mathcal{T}(\cdot) := \sum_{j=1}^J \mathcal{T}_j \otimes \mathcal{R}_j(\cdot)$$

with $\mathcal{T}_j \in \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{R}_j \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K})$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, such that for a given $\tau \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$

$$F(\mathcal{T}(\rho_i^{\otimes l}), \phi) \geq 1 - \tau \qquad\qquad (i \in \{1, ..., N\}) \tag{116}$$

holds, where ϕ is a maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{K}$ and $\dim \mathcal{K} = 2^{lR}$. We fix notations

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j^{(i)} &:= \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{T}_j \otimes \mathcal{R}_j(\rho_i^{\otimes l})), \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_j^{(i)} := \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(i)}} \mathcal{T}_j \otimes R_j(\rho_i^{\otimes l}), \\ \rho_j^{(i)} &:= \frac{1}{\lambda_j^{(i)}} \mathcal{T}_j \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l}}(\rho_i^{\otimes l}) \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in [N]$, $j \in [J]$ with $\lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0$. Application of $\mathcal{T}$ on ρ_i results in the state

$$\Omega^{(i)} := \sum_{j : \lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} \omega_j^{(i)}.$$

Using the relation from (9), (116) implies, that

$$\|\Omega^{(i)} - \phi\|_1 \leq 2\sqrt{\tau}$$

holds for all $i \in [N]$, which leads us to

$$|S(A|B, \Omega^{(i)}) - S(A|B, \phi)| \leq \epsilon \tag{117}$$

with $\epsilon := 2(2\sqrt{\tau} \log(\dim \mathcal{K}^2) + \eta(2\sqrt{\tau}))$ via twofold application of Fannes' inequality. Eq. (117) along with $S(A\rangle B, \phi) = -l \cdot R$ implies

$$lR \leq -S(A|B, \Omega^{(i)}) + 4\sqrt{\tau} \cdot lR + 2\eta(2\sqrt{\tau}) \tag{118}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(A|B, \Omega^{(i)}) &\geq \sum_{j : \lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \omega_j^{(i)}) \\ &\geq \sum_{j : \lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \rho_j^{(i)}) \end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

the first inequality is by concavity of the map $\rho \mapsto S(A|B, \rho)$ for quantum states, the second is by application of the quantum data processing inequality. Combining (118) and (119), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} lR &\leq -\max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j : \lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \rho_j^{(i)}) + 4\sqrt{\tau} l \cdot R + 2\eta(2\sqrt{\tau}) \\ &\leq -\min_{\mathcal{T}} \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j : \lambda_j^{(i)} \neq 0} \lambda_j^{(i)} S(A|B, \rho_j^{(i)}) + 4\sqrt{\tau} l \cdot R + 2\eta(2\sqrt{\tau}) \\ &\leq D^{(1)}(\mathcal{X}^{\otimes l}) + 4\sqrt{\tau} l \cdot R + 2\eta(2\sqrt{\tau}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3. *The above Theorem shows, that one may have to pay an additional price for imperfect knowledge of the state. Namely, the capacity for a set $\mathcal{X}$ is, in general, strictly smaller than the minimum over the single-state capacities of the individual states in $\mathcal{X}$, as can be seen from eq. (112).*

6.2 Entanglement generation over compound quantum channels

Finally, we give another proof for the direct part of the coding theorem for entanglement generation over compound channels, which was originally given in Theorem 13 in [8]. First we recall some definitions from [8]. Let $\mathfrak{I}$ be a compound quantum channel generated by a set $\mathfrak{I} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B)$ of channels. We consider the uninformed user scenario, where precise knowledge about the identity of the channel is available neither to encoder nor decoder. An entanglement generating (l, k_l)-code for $\mathfrak{I}$ is a pair $(\mathcal{R}^l, \varphi^l)$ where $\mathcal{R}^l \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^l)$ is a channel with $k_l = \dim \mathcal{K}^l$ and φ_l a pure state on $\mathcal{K}^l \otimes \mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}$. A positive number R is an achievable rate for entangelement generation over $\mathfrak{I}$ if there is a sequence of (l, k_l)-entanglement generating codes satisfying

1. $\liminf_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l} \log k_l \geq R$, and
2. $\lim_{l\to\infty} \inf_{\mathcal{N}\in\mathfrak{I}} F(\phi_l, (id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R}^l \circ \mathcal{N}^{\otimes l})(\varphi_l)) = 1$ where ϕ_l denotes a maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{K}^l \otimes \mathcal{K}^l$.

The number

$$E(\mathfrak{I}) := \sup\{R : R \,\text{achievable}\}. \tag{120}$$

is called the *entanglement generating capacity* of $\mathfrak{I}$.

Theorem 9 (cf. [8], Th. 13)**.** *Let $\mathfrak{I} := \{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ be a finite compound quantum channel, $\mathfrak{I} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B)$. Then*

$$E(\mathfrak{I}) \geq \lim_{l\to\infty} \frac{1}{l} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l})} \min_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}) \tag{121}$$

holds

Proof. First note that the limit in (121) exists by standard arguments (see [8], Remark 2). We just have to prove that the number

$$\min_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon$$

is an achievable rate for every state ρ on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and every $\epsilon > 0$, the rest is by standard blocking arguments. There is nothing to prove for sets with $\min_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) \leq 0$. Therefore let ρ be a state on $\mathcal{H}_A$ with $\min_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) > 0$. Consider the set $\mathcal{X} := \{\rho_i\}_{i=1}^N$ of bipartite states in $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ with

$$\rho_i = (id_{\mathcal{H}_A} \otimes \mathcal{N}_i)(\chi) \tag{122}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Here χ is the pure state on $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ such that the partial trace over any of the two subsystems results in the state ρ. We show that a good entanglement distillation protocol for the set $\mathcal{X}$ of bipartite states generated by $\mathfrak{I}$ implies the existence of a good entanglement generation code for $\mathfrak{I}$. Following the proof of Lemma 12, there exists an (l, k_l)-distillation protocol $\mathcal{T} = \sum_{k=0}^D \mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{R}_k$ for $\mathcal{X}$ with $\mathcal{A}_k \in \mathcal{C}^{\downarrow}(\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^l)$ and $\mathcal{R}_k \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_B^{\otimes l}, \mathcal{K}^l)$ for $k \in \{1, ..., D\}$ with D determined by $\dim \mathcal{H}_A$ and $\dim \mathcal{K}^l$ such that

$$\dim \mathcal{K}^l \geq \lfloor 2^{l(\min_{1\leq i\leq N} I_c(\rho,\mathcal{N}_i)-\epsilon)} \rfloor \tag{123}$$

and

$$\min_{1\leq i\leq N} F(\mathcal{T}(\rho_i), \phi_l) \geq 1 - o(l^0) \tag{124}$$

with ϕ_l being the maximally entangled state on $\mathcal{K}^l$. Notice, that in eq. (123), we used the identity

$$I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) = -S(A|B, \rho_i)$$

for every $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$. The definitions given in eq. (122) imply

$$\mathcal{A}_k \otimes \mathcal{R}_k(\rho) = (id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k \circ \mathcal{N}_i)(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}}(\chi))$$

for every $0 \leq k \leq D$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathcal{T}(\rho_i), \phi_l) &= \sum_{k=0}^{D} F(id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}}(\chi)), \phi_l) \\ &= \sum_{k: p_k \neq 0} p_k F(id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(\varphi_k), \phi_l) \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

holds for every i, where we used the definitions

$$p_k := \mathrm{tr}(\mathcal{A}_k(\rho)), \text{ and } \qquad \varphi_k := \frac{1}{p_k}(\mathcal{A}_k \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes l}})(\chi)$$

for $p_k \neq 0$, $0 \leq k \leq D$. Notice, that $\varphi_0, ..., \varphi_D$ are pure states, because the operations $\mathcal{A}_k$ are pure since they arise from an L-merging (see the proof of Lemma 12). Again because the fidelities are affine functions of the first input, (124) and (125) imply

$$\sum_{k: p_k \neq 0} p_k F\left(id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R}_k \circ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(\varphi_k), \phi_l\right) \geq 1 - o(l^0). \tag{126}$$

The RHS of equation (125) is, in fact, an average of fidelities of entanglement generating codes $(\mathcal{R}_1, \varphi_1), ..., (\mathcal{R}_D, \varphi_D)$ with probabilities $p_1, ..., p_D$. This implies the existence of a number $k' \in \{1, ..., D\}$ such that with $\varphi := \varphi_{k'}$ and $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}_{k'}$

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} F\left(id_{\mathcal{K}^l} \otimes \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{N}_i^{\otimes l}(\varphi), \phi_l\right) \geq 1 - o(l^0) \tag{127}$$

holds. Eqns. (127) and (123) show that

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq N} I_c(\rho, \mathcal{N}_i) - \epsilon$$

is an achievable rate. □

To conclude this section we compare the proof of Theorem 9 given above with the one given in [8]. The original achievability proof relies on the fact that good entanglement generation codes can be deduced from entanglement transmission codes working good on maximally mixed states on certain subspaces of the input space of the channels. The passage to arbitrary states is done by a compound version of the so-called BSST lemma from [6]. Indeed, one of the results from [8] is that the entanglement transmission capacity $\mathcal{Q}(\mathfrak{I})$ equals $E(\mathfrak{I})$ for every compound channel $\mathfrak{I}$.

The proof given above follows a more direct route by taking advantage of a direct correspondence between entanglement distillation from bipartite states and entanglement generation over quantum channels, which is very close even in the compound setting. In this way, we have demonstrated, that quantum state merging provides a genuine approach to problems of entanglement generation over quantum channels even in the compound setting.

7 Conclusion

In this work, we have extended the concept of quantum state merging to the case, where the users are partially ignorant of the parameters which describe the state they keep. We have determined the optimal entanglement cost of state merging in this setting, and found out that, in principle, a merging process is possible with the worst case merging cost in the set representing this uncertainty. We also derived a lower bound on the classical cost for merging with state uncertainty, based on an elementary proof of the corresponding result for single states. Whether or not this bound is achievable in general, is left as an open question. In particular, we have shown, that the class of protocols (called "L-mergings" in this work), which containes protocols optimal for the quantum as well the classical part of the state merging problem in case of perfectly known states is suboptimal in its classical costs for situations with state uncertainty. However, in some special cases, protocols which are minor variations of the L-merging concept achieve this bound.

Despite this, the protocol preserved its good reputation as a communication primitive regarding the quantum performance. We were able, to apply our results to prove corresponding assertions in other communication settings as entanglement distillation under state uncertainty as well as entanglement generation under channel uncertainty. To apply these results in more complicated situations as multiuser settings (e.g. entanglement generation over quantum multiple access channels) is an interesting topic for further research activities.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Prof. K.-E. Hellwig, and J. Nötzel for their encouragement and many stimulating discussions. The work of I.B. and H.B. is supported by the DFG via grant BO 1734/20-1 and by the BMBF via grant 01BQ1050.

References

[1] A. Abeyesinghe, I. Devetak, P. Hayden, and A. Winter. The mother of all protocols: restructuring quantum information's family tree. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 465, 2537 (2009). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0606225

[2] R. Ahlswede. Elimination of correlation in random codes for arbitrarily varying channels. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verw. Gebiete* 44, 159 (1978). Available under http://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/ahlswede/homepage/public/29.pdf

[3] R. Ahlswede. Coloring hypergraphs: A new approach to multi-user source coding II. *Journ. of Combinatorics, Information and System Sciences* 5, 220 (1980). Available under http://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/ahlswede/homepage/public/36.pdf

[4] R. Ahlswede, I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, and J. Nötzel. Quantum capacity under adversarial quantum noise: arbitrarily varying quantum channels (2011). eprint: arXiv:1010.0418.

[5] H. Araki and E. H. Lieb. Entropy inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 18, 160 (1970).

[6] C. Bennett, P. Shor, J. Smolin, and A. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 48, 2637 (2002).

[7] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, and J. Nötzel. Quantum capacity of a class of compound channels. *Phys. Rev. A* 78, 042331 (2008)

[8] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, and J. Nötzel. Entanglement transmission and generation under channel uncertainty: Universal quantum channel coding. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 292, 55 (2009). eprint: arXiv:0811.4588.

[9] I. Csiszár and J. Körner. *Information Theory - Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems* (2. ed.) Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[10] I. Csiszár and P. Narayan. The capacity of the arbitrarily varying channel revisited: positivity, constraints. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 34, 181 (1988).

[11] I. Devetak and A. Winter. Distillation of secret key and entanglement from quantum states. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* 461, 207 (2005). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0306078

[12] I. Devetak and A. W. Harrow and A. Winter A Resource Framework for Quantum Shannon Theory *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 54, 4587-4618 (2008). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0512015

[13] M. Fannes. A continuity property of the entropy density for spin lattice systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 31, 291 (1973).

[14] M. Fekete. Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 17, 228 (1923).

[15] C. A. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf. Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum mechanical states. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 45, 1216 (2007). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/9712042v2

[16] B. Groisman, S. Popescu, and A. Winter. Quantum, classical, and total amount of correlations in a quantum state. *Phys. Rev. A* 72, 032317 (2005). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0410091

[17] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter. Partial quantum information. *Nature* 436, 673 (2005). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0505062

[18] M. Horodecki, J. Oppenheim, and A. Winter. Quantum state merging and negative information. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 269, 107 (2007). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0512247

[19] R. Jozsa. Fidelity for mixed quantum states. *J. Mod. Opt.* 41, 2315 (1994).

[20] V. Milman and G. Schechtman. *Asymptotic Theory of Finite Dimensional Normed Spaces.* Springer-Verlag, 1980.

[21] B. Schumacher. Sending entanglement through noisy quantum channels. *Phys. Rev. A* 54, 2614 (1996). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/9604023.

[22] B. Schumacher and M. Westmoreland. Approximate quantum error correction. *Quantum Inf. Processing* 1, 5 (2002). eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0112106.

[23] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf. Noiseless coding of correlated information sources. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* 19, 471 (1973).

[24] A. Uhlmann. The 'transition probability' in the state space of a *-algebra. *Rep. Math. Phys.* 9, 273 (1976).

[25] A. Winter. Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* 45, 2481 (1999).